

Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 STATE 011657

64

ORIGIN OES-05

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 HUD-02 CEQ-01 EPA-04 COME-00

FEA-01 AID-05 CIAE-00 OFA-01 DODE-00 EB-07 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSF-02 NSC-05 NSAE-00 PM-04 USIA-15 SS-15

SP-02 INT-05 CEA-01 EA-09 FRB-01 NEA-10 OPIC-06

TRSE-00 CIEP-02 LAB-04 SIL-01 OMB-01 AGR-10 /153 R

DRAFTED BY OES/ENP/EN:P.GLASOE:DR

APPROVED BY OES/ENP/EN:LINDSEY GRANT

OES/ENP:C.A. HERTER (SUBS)

OES/ENP/EN:D. KING (PARA 11)

HUD:R. BROUN (SUBS)

CEQ:E. LUBENSKY (SUBS)

EPA:J. THOMPSON (DRAFT

EUR/RPE:G. WOLFE

COMMERCE:P F. ABBUHL (SUBS)

COMMERCE: R. GRANT (SUBS)

----- 009316

P 162226Z JAN 76

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION OECD PARIS PRIORITY

UNCLAS STATE 011657

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: SENV,

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE - NEW PROPOSALS FOR 1977
PROGRAM.

REFERENCE: OECD PARIS 0612

1. AMONG THE SEVERAL PROPOSED NEW PROJECTS FOR THE 1977
PROGRAM, WE ASSIGN HIGHEST PRIORITY TO THE FOLLOWING:

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 011657

A. MEASURING THE EVOLUTION OF THE STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT IN MEMBER OECD COUNTRIES - AND THE ASSOCIATED EXPENDITURES;

B. POLLUTION CONTROL COST STUDIES;

C. APPLICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA AND STANDARDS TO LAND USE PLANNING;

D. CONTROL STRATEGIES FOR SOLVING ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS CAUSED BY SO 2.

2. WE ASSIGN MEDIUM TO HIGH PRIORITY TO:

A. ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES FOR MANAGEMENT OF INDUSTRIALIZED RIVER BASINS.

3. WE ASSIGN MEDIUM PRIORITY TO:

A. INTERNATIONAL RELOCATION OF INDUSTRY INDUCED BY ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY;

B. MANAGEMENT OF URBAN SERVICES;

C. ESTABLISHMENT OF METHODOLOGY ON SETTING ASSIMILATIVE CAPACITY OF WATER BODIES.

4. IN SETTING THESE PRIORITIES, WE HAVE, OF COURSE CONSULTED WITH INTERESTED AGENCIES. CRITERIA USED WERE PRINCIPALLY: IS THERE A REAL INTERNATIONAL CONNECTION? IS THERE GOOD REASON WHY OECD (AS OPPOSED TO SOME OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OR BILATERAL CHANNELS) SHOULD DEAL WITH THE ISSUE? IS THE ISSUE RIPE FOR CONSTRUCTIVE/PRODUCTIVE ATTENTION NOW? IS THERE POTENTIAL VALUE TO US INTERESTS IN THE PROSECUTION OF AND RESULTS POTENTIALLY TO EMANATE FROM THE PROJECT? JUDGED AGAINST SUCH CRITERIA, SOME OF THE PROJECTS WHICH CLEARLY DEAL WITH ISSUES OF MAJOR ACTUAL OR POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE DID NOT RATE HIGH ON OUR PRIORITIES LIST. AN EXAMPLE OF THIS IS THE FOOD PROJECT (SEE PARA 11 BELOW).

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 011657

5. FOR USE BY THE MISSION IN NEGOTIATING THE DRAFT 1977 PROGRAM WITH OTHER DELEGATIONS AND THE SECRETARIAT, THERE FOLLOW SOME EXPLANATORY COMMENTS ON CERTAIN PROJECTS.

6. CONCERNING THE SECRETARIAT AND UK PROJECTS ON MEASURING THE STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND RELATED COSTS AND BENEFITS, WE BELIEVE THIS PROJECT IS OF REAL POTENTIAL BENEFIT

TO MEMBER COUNTRIES IN HELPING THEM DEFINE AND QUALITATIVELY ASSESS PROGRESS IN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT. WE DO NOT VOTE MERELY FOR THE PROJECT OUTLINED IN THE SECRETARIAT'S PAPER (C.R.DOC 5), SINCE WE AGREE WITH THE UK AND OTHERS THAT IT IS DESIRABLE TO PURSUE THE ISSUE OF TRYING TO QUANTIFY PARTICULARLY THE BENEFITS FROM ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (OR, CONVERSELY, THE COSTS OF CONTINUING ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGES), AND THAT SUCH EFFORTS TIE IN LOGICALLY WITH ATTEMPTS TO MEASURE HOW FAR WE HAVE COME (AND WHERE WE ARE GOING) IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION. HOWEVER, WE STRONGLY FEEL THAT INITIAL EMPHASIS SHOULD BE PLACED ON THOSE IDEAS CONTAINED IN THE SECRETARIAT'S PAPER, WITH ONLY SECONDARY ATTENTION FOCUSED ON THE "PURE" COST/BENEFIT ASPECTS STRESSED IN THE UK PROPOSAL. SAID ANOTHER WAY, WE WOULD NOT WANT TO SEE THIS PROJECT CONCENTRATE ON ATTEMPTS TO SET DETAILED PRICE AND "VALUE" TAGS ON EXISTING AND PROSPECTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACTIVITIES (AS WE SUSPECT THE UK MAY BE HOPING). TO BE

DONE WELL AND THUS USEFUL, THIS IS A LONG-TERM PROJECT AND INITIALLY THE EFFORT SHOULD BE PLACED ON WORK ON PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGIES (POINT 3(I) IN C.R. DOC 5), AS CONTRASTED WITH ACTUAL QUANTIFICATION OF DATA.

7. CONCERNING POLLUTION CONTROL COST STUDIES, THE DECEMBER MEETING OF THE GROUP OF ECONOMIC EXPERTS ASSIGNED SUCH STUDIES HIGHEST PRIORITY (ALONG WITH THE "EVOLUTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT" DISCUSSED ABOVE). HOWEVER, C.R. DOC 14 IS NOT A REAL "PROJECT PROPOSAL," AND ASSUMING THERE IS AGREEMENT TO INCLUDE IT IN THE DRAFT 1977 PROGRAM, WE WILL BE TRANSMITTING EARLY NEXT WEEK SUGGESTIONS AS TO HOW WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THIS PROJECT DEFINED AND PURSUED.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 011657

8. WE HAVE INCLUDED THE NORWEGIAN/SWEDISH PROJECT ON SULFUR DIOXIDE CONTROL STRATEGIES ON OUR HIT PARADE, BUT WE DO NOT BELIEVE THE TIME IS RIPE TO INCLUDE A PROJECT AS DEFINED IN THE SCANDINAVIAN PROPOSAL IN THE 1977 PROGRAM. THAT IS, IT IS HIGH PRIORITY IN GENERAL, BUT WE WOULD NOT SEE A MAJOR PROJECT DEVELOPING UNTIL 1978, WITH PROBABLY ONLY LOW LEVEL PREPARATORY OR ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITIES BEING CONDUCTED IN 1977. OUR REASONING IS THAT THE PROJECT AS DRAFTED ASSUMES TOO MUCH IN VIEW OF THE (INCOMPLETE) STATUS OF THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORT PROJECT. THE FINAL REPORT WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE UNTIL LATER THIS YEAR AND THE MAJOR CONFERENCE THE NORWEGIANS ARE ORGANIZING ON EFFECTS DOES NOT TAKE PLACE UNTIL JUNE. THE RESULTS OF THESE ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE REVIEWED CAREFULLY AS PART OF PREPARATION FOR THE "NEXT PHASE" OF THE SULFUR DIOXIDE

PROGRAM, RATHER THAN HAVING THAT PHASE DEFINED BEFORE SUCH RESULTS ARE EVEN AVAILABLE.

9. CONCERNING THE TWO WATER PROJECTS (INDUSTRIALIZED RIVER BASINS AND ASSIMILATIVE CAPACITY), WE AGREE THAT THEY CAN LOGICALLY BE COMBINED INTO ONE PROJECT. WITHIN IT, HOWEVER, WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE MAJOR EMPHASIS PLACED ON THE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT ASPECTS.

10. CONCERNING THE US "PROJECT" ON THE ENERGY FEASIBILITY STUDY (C.R. DOC 13), WE REITERATE THAT THE FEASIBILITY STUDY WAS APPROVED AT THE NOVEMBER MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE. (WE HOPE TO WORK UP A QUESTIONNAIRE DURING ACHILLADELIS' VISIT). DEPENDING ON THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY (REPLIES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE WOULD BE ASSESSED LATER THIS YEAR), A PROJECT MAY OR MAY NOT MAKE SENSE FOR 1977. IF SUCH A PROJECT DOES SEEM FEASIBLE, WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE OF SUCH MAGNITUDE AS TO REQUIRE SOME SORT OF LEAD COUNTRY OR PART II APPROACH. ALTERNATIVELY, IT MIGHT BE MELDED TOGETHER WITH WORK IEA COULD BE DOING. OUR PAPER DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CAREFULLY DEFINED "ENERGY RESIDUALS ASSESSMENT" PROJECT, AND WE CANNOT ASK OTHER MEMBERS TO AGREE TO SET ASIDE A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF SECRETARIAT RESOURCES FOR 1977 TO BE USED ON A POSSIBLE PROJECT, THE DIMENSIONS OF WHICH ARE NOT AT ALL CLEAR. THUS, WHILE THE GENERAL IDEA RATES A "HIGHEST PRIORITY," WE CANNOT UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 011657

REALISTICALLY LOBBY FOR A 1977 PROJECT WHICH COULD ONLY BE ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AT THE COST OF MORE CERTAIN AND CLEARLY DEFINED EQUALLY HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS.

11. WE HAVE NOT RATED THE SECRETARIAT (READ RODERICK'S) PROPOSAL ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES AND FOOD PRODUCTION DESPITE THE FACT THAT THE WHOLE FOOD ISSUE IS CLEARLY ONE OF PARAMOUNT INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE. WE DO NOT BELIEVE SUCH A PROJECT IS AN APPROPRIATE ONE FOR THE OECD'S ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE. AMONG OUR REASONS ARE THE FACT THAT THE OECD IS AN ORGANIZATION OF DEVELOPED COUNTRIES, WHILE MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASING THE WORLD FOOD SUPPLY WILL ARISE IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. SUCH A FOOD-ENVIRONMENT PROJECT IN OUR VIEW THEREFORE MORE APPROPRIATELY SHOULD FALL TO THE UN ORGANIZATIONS. COMPLICATING THE MATTER IS THAT ANY CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES DEALING WITH EXPANDING FOOD PRODUCTION CANNOT BE DIVORCED FROM THE ISSUE OF POPULATION. THIS CLEARLY GOES EVEN FURTHER BEYOND THE MANDATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE. IN A LESS GENERAL AND MORE PRACTICAL VEIN, A PROJECT SUCH AS THE SECRETARIAT PROPOSES WOULD HAVE TO BE SHARPLY DEFINED IF IT WERE TO MAKE ANY SENSE FOR A GROUP SUCH AS'

THE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE TO TACKLE. SUCH DEFINITION AUTOMATICALLY LEADS TO THE TWO ISSUES OF PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZERS. HOWEVER, IN THE CASE OF THE FORMER, DEVELOPED COUNTRIES ARE USING LESS, RATHER THAN MORE, THANKS TO "INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT" APPROACHES. REFERTILIZERS, ONLY NITROGEN WOULD APPEAR TO POSE A POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE, AND THAT IS BEING DEALT WITH IN OTHER FORA, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF EUTROPHICATION, WHICH THE OECD IS ALREADY CONSIDERING.

12. IN SUM, WHILE RECOGNIZING THAT THE GENERAL ISSUE IS BOTH INTERESTING AND CRITICAL, AND THAT RODERICK WILL PROBABLY PUSH FOR INCLUSION OF THIS PROJECT IN THE 1977 PROGRAM, WE DO NOT FEEL THAT OTHER, MORE MANAGEABLE, RELEVANT (TO THE OECD COUNTRIES), AND "IMMEDIATE" ISSUES SHOULD BE SACRIFICED FOR THE SAKE OF SUCH A PROJECT. WE HOPE THE MISSION WILL BE ABLE TO KEEP IT OUT OF THE DRAFT PROGRAM.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 011657

13. WE WILL LOOK FORWARD TO A REPORT ON THE JANUARY 19 MEETING. WE HOPE IT WILL INCLUDE INFO ON POSITIONS TAKEN

BY KEY COUNTRIES IN RELATION TO OUR "HIGH PRIORITY" PROJECTS, AS WELL AS THOSE OF HIGH PRIORITY TO OTHERS AND NOT US. KISSINGER

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ENVIRONMENT, MEETING AGENDA, COMMITTEE MEETINGS, PROGRAMS (PROJECTS)
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 JAN 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976STATE011657
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: P.GLASOE:DR
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760017-0777
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760148/aaaabqvn.tel
Line Count: 254
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN OES
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 76 OECD PARIS 612
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 18 JUN 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <18 JUN 2004 by schwenja>; APPROVED <12 NOV 2004 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE - NEW PROPOSALS FOR 1977 PROGRAM.
TAGS: SENV
To: OECD PARIS
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006